

## **APPENDIX A – ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED BUT NOT SELECTED**















**THE PORTICO GROUP**



**DESIGN COMPANY**

1000 N. 10th St. Suite 100  
Phoenix, AZ 85004  
Tel: 602.441.1000  
Fax: 602.441.1001

**PREFERRED PLAN**

# Jefferson Park




November, 2001

## **APPENDIX B – TRANSPORTATION**

### Jefferson Park EIS – On-Street Parking Supply and Utilization Summary Block-face-by-block-face

Segment	Street Name	Street Segment	Side of Street	Number of Unrestricted Parking Spaces	Number of Parking Spaces in No Park between 7-9 am and 4-6 pm Zone	Number of Parking Spaces in No Park between 7-9 am Zone	Weekday Parking Spaces 3-5 pm	Weekday Parking Spaces 7-8 pm	Weekend Parking Spaces 3-4 pm	Thursday 4/4/02 3-5 p.m.	Friday 4/5/02 3-5 p.m.	Thursday 4/4/02 7-8 p.m.	Friday 4/5/02 7-8 p.m.	Saturday 4/6/02 3-4 p.m.	Sunday 4/6/02 3-4 p.m.
A	Spokane St	West of 15th Ave	N	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
B	Spokane St	West of 15th Ave	S	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
C	Columbian Way	West of 15th Ave	N	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
D	Columbian Way	West of 15th Ave	S	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
E	S Dakota St	West of 15th Ave	N	8	0	0	8	8	8	1	2	4	5	2	2
F	S Dakota St	West of 15th Ave	S	8	0	0	8	8	8	1	0	0	0	0	1
G	S Nevada St	West of 15th Ave	N	5	0	0	5	5	5	0	0	1	0	1	2
H	S Nevada St	West of 15th Ave	S	5	0	0	5	5	5	0	0	0	1	0	1
I	15th Ave S	North of Spokane St	W	0	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	0
J	15th Ave S	North of Spokane St	E	0	0	1	0	1	1	0	0	1	0	0	0
K	15th Ave S	South of Spokane St	W	5	14	0	5	19	19	3	4	5	4	5	4
L	15th Ave S	South of Spokane St	E	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
M	15th Ave S	North of Dakota St	E	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
N	15th Ave S	North of Dakota St	W	0	20	0	0	20	20	0	0	0	0	0	0
O	15th Ave S	South of Dakota St	W	0	10	0	0	10	10	0	0	0	0	0	0
P	15th Ave S	South of Dakota St	E	0	14	0	0	14	14	0	0	0	0	0	0
Q	15th Ave S	North of Nevada St	W	0	11	0	0	11	11	0	0	0	0	0	0
R	15th Ave S	North of Nevada St	E	0	9	0	0	9	9	0	0	0	0	0	0
S	15th Ave S	South of Nevada St	W	0	7	0	0	7	7	0	0	0	1	1	0
T	15th Ave S	South of Nevada St	E	0	7	0	0	7	7	0	0	0	0	0	0
U	S Spokane St	East of 15th Ave	N	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
V	S Spokane St	East of 15th Ave	S	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
W	15th Ave S free right to Spokane	East of 15th Ave	N	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
X	15th Ave S free right to Spokane	East of 15th Ave	S	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Y	S Dakota St	East of 15th Ave	N	4	0	0	4	4	4	0	0	0	0	0	2
Z	S Dakota St	East of 15th Ave	S	6	0	0	6	6	6	0	1	1	1	0	1
AA	S Nevada St	East of 15th Ave	N	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
BB	S Nevada St	East of 15th Ave	S	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
CC	16th Ave S	North of Spokane St	W	9	0	0	9	9	9	6	4	8	8	6	7
DD	16th Ave S	North of Spokane St	E	10	0	0	10	10	10	2	5	5	5	6	3



Segment	Street Name	Street Segment	Side of Street	Number of Unrestricted Parking Spaces	Number of Parking Spaces in No Park between 7-9 am and 4-6 pm Zone	Number of Parking Spaces in No Park between 7-9 am Zone	Weekday Parking Spaces 3-5 pm	Weekday Parking Spaces 7-8 pm	Weekend Parking Spaces 3-4 pm	Thursday 4/4/02 3-5 p.m.	Friday 4/5/02 3-5 p.m.	Thursday 4/4/02 7-8 p.m.	Friday 4/5/02 7-8 p.m.	Saturday 4/6/02 3-4 p.m.	Sunday 4/6/02 3-4 p.m.
EE	16th Ave S	South of Dakota St	W	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
FF	16th Ave S	South of Dakota St	E	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
GG	16th Ave S	South of Nevada St	W	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
HH	S Spokane St	East of 16th Ave	N	4	0	0	4	4	4	3	3	3	3	3	4
II	S Spokane St	East of 16th Ave	S	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
JJ	S Spokane St	East of 16th Ave	N	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
KK	S Spokane St	East of 16th Ave	S	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
LL	17th Ave S	North of Spokane St	W	15	0	0	15	15	15	8	8	10	12	7	11
MM	17th Ave S	North of Spokane St	E	16	0	0	16	16	16	4	6	7	8	6	6
NN	S Spokane St	East of 17th Ave	N	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
OO	S Spokane St	East of 17th Ave	S	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
PP	Lafayette Ave S	North of Spokane St	W	14	0	0	14	14	14	6	6	6	5	5	4
QQ	Lafayette Ave S	North of Spokane St	E	10	0	0	10	10	10	3	3	3	2	1	2
RR	S Spokane St	East of Lafayette Ave	N	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
SS	Alamo Pl S	North of Spokane St	W	9	0	0	9	9	9	3	5	2	3	3	3
TT	Alamo Pl S	North of Spokane St	E	15	0	0	15	15	15	0	5	4	6	5	2
UU	S Spokane St	East of Alamo Pl	N	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
VV	Beacon Ave S	North of Spokane St	W	11	0	0	11	11	11	6	8	5	8	10	8
WW	Beacon Ave S	North of Spokane St	E	6	0	0	6	6	6	3	1	3	2	3	2
XX	Beacon Ave S	South of Spokane St	W	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
YY	Beacon Ave S	South of Spokane St	E	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
ZZ	S Spokane St	East of Beacon Ave	N	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
AAA	S Spokane St	East of Beacon Ave	S	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
BBB	18th Ave S	North of Spokane St	W	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
CCC	18th Ave S	North of Spokane St	E	6	0	0	6	6	6	4	4	1	4	4	4
DDD	S Spokane St	East of 18th Ave	N	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	<b>TOTAL</b>			<b>166</b>	<b>93</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>166</b>	<b>260</b>	<b>260</b>	<b>53</b>	<b>65</b>	<b>69</b>	<b>78</b>	<b>69</b>	<b>74</b>
										Time Period					
										Average Parking Demand =					
										Existing On-Street Parking Utilization =					
										3-5 PM					
										7-8 PM					
										1:00 PM					
										59					
										74					
										28%					
										28%					

## **APPENDIX C – RESPONSES TO COMMENTS**



June 7, 2002

Kenneth R. Bounds, Superintendent  
Seattle Department of Parks and Recreation  
100 Dexter Ave. N.  
Seattle, WA 98109

Comments on the Jefferson Park Site Plan Draft EIS

Dear Mr. Bounds:

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Jefferson Park Site Plan Draft EIS. Sound Transit has been coordinating with the Department of Parks and Recreation on the Jefferson Park project, specifically on the potential of using excavated material generated from the Beacon Hill tunnel segment of the Link Light Rail project as fill material for the decommissioning of the North Reservoir.

Based on our most recent design information, we anticipate approximately 350,000 cubic yards of material to be excavated over a period of approximately thirty-one months. Excavation will occur in three places: the west portal, the east portal, and the station site. The majority of material will be excavated from the station site and the west portal. Excavation duration for each site is different and therefore the number of truck loads per day will vary. The number of total truck loads has been calculated assuming fifteen cubic yards of excavated material per load. Based on this assumption, we anticipate a total of approximately 24,000 truck loads to be hauled from the three sites. For approximately nine months beginning in the fall of 2004 (based on current schedule), there is a potential for up to 36 truck loads a day to be removed from the west portal.

Although this information is different than what was previously identified, the transportation impacts from this level of construction truck traffic are consistent with the analysis in the Central Link FEIS (November 1999) and the Initial Segment Environmental Assessment (February 2002).

We look forward to continuing coordination on this project. If you have any questions or concerns, please contact me at 206.398.5140.

Sincerely,

James Irish  
Link Environmental Manager

c. Perry Weinberg, SEPA Responsible Official  
Don Billen, Project Manager

Central Puget Sound  
Regional Transit Authority  
Union Station  
401 S. Jackson St.  
Seattle, WA 98104-2826  
Reception 206.398.5000  
Facsimile 206.398.5499  
www.soundtransit.org

**Chair**

Ren Sims  
*King County Executive*

**Vice Chairs**

Dave Earling  
*President, Edmonds City Council*

John Ladelburg  
*Pierce County Executive*

Jack Crawford  
*Keeney Councilmember*

Bob Drewel  
 *Snohomish County Executive*

David Enslow  
*Samuel Councilmember*

Mary Gates  
*Federal Way Councilmember*

Jane Hague  
*King County Councilmember*

Ed Hansen  
 *Everett Mayor*

Doug MacDonald  
*Washington State Department of Transportation Secretary*

Richard McIver  
*Seattle Councilmember*

Chuck Mosher  
*Bellvue Councilmember*

Greg Nickels  
*Seattle Mayor*

Julia Patterson  
*King County Councilmember*

Dwight Pele  
*King County Councilmember*

Kevin Phelps  
*Tacoma Councilmember*

Cynthia Sullivan  
*Chair, King County Council*

Claudia Thomas  
*Lakewood Deputy Mayor*

**Executive Director**

Joni Earl



## **Responses to Sound Transit**

1. Comment noted.
2. The Seattle Department of Parks and Recreation is pleased to have the updated information regarding Sound Transit's planned excavation work for the Beacon Hill Tunnel segment of the Link Light Rail project.
3. Comment noted.
4. Parks will continue to explore use of excavated fill material generated from the Central Link project and to coordinate with Sound Transit to minimize truck activity from the two projects.

**Don Bullard - RE: Jefferson Park Site Plan - Draft EIS Comment Period & Public Hearing**

---

>>> Larry McCann <lmccann@hmhs.hmc.washington.edu> 05/17/02 02:04PM >>>  
Mr. Bullard,

Thanks for sending the announcement for the Public Hearing. This is my response which I want you to include in the hearing process.

The proposed North Reservoir Plan is unacceptable because it fails to provide the children of Beacon Hill with a suitable outdoor recreation space. The plan pretends to provide 2 soccer fields, but in fact has none. The small open spaced area called U-10 (under 10 years of age) fields have water hazards immediately adjacent and they are graded with hills that will make balls roll uncontrolled. Ball play would be impractical if not dangerous on such fields. Existing open space in the area does not accommodate playfields which are typically found at all Seattle Community Centers. A full size soccer/football field is needed in the near future. The long-range plan is unfunded and unlikely to receive funding in the foreseeable future.

1

2

I've noticed that a gymnasium is added to plan. I'm glad to see that the plan is a working document subject to change. I would like a soccer field added as well.

3

I recommend that at least 50% of the open space created by the removal of the reservoir be designated for suitable use by the children who live in the area. At least one full size soccer field is essential.

4

Please forward my comments to all planners and others who are involved in the public hearing.

Thank you,  
Larry McCann  
Stake holder for our children on the hill.

## **Responses to Larry McCann**

1. The Draft Environmental Impact Statement evaluated two park site plan alternatives and a no action alternative. Alternative A—Interim Plan, does contain provisions for soccer. An all-season turf soccer field is planned as part of the renovations of Jefferson Field. While not specifically designated for soccer, small children could play soccer in the Great Meadow area. In Alternative B—Long-range Plan, a full-size soccer field is included as part of the Sports Plateau. A running track and a baseball field will also be a part of that complex.
2. As a result of public input, the Mayor has proposed an initiative to reconstruct buried reservoirs at all reservoirs in the City to create 76 acres of open space for park use. City Council approval of the Mayor's plan is still required, but if the plan is approved will expedite funding to allow implementation of the additional soccer field at Jefferson Park.
3. Under Alternative A, a new gymnasium would be built west of the existing Community Center. This alternative also calls for a Community Center Activities Building to be constructed to the north of the existing Community Center. The existing Community Center would be demolished after the new building is constructed. Under Alternative B, a second gymnasium would be constructed. As described above, an additional soccer field would be provided under Alternative B, should the South Reservoir area become available for park use.
4. The play and recreation needs of the area's children were taken into consideration when the project alternatives were designed. Under Alternative A—Interim Plan, the Great Meadow and Terrace areas would be undesignated open space available to children for play and recreation. In addition, a new children's play area would be constructed as part of the new Community Center Activities Building, and a skateboard area and bocce ball court would also be constructed to accommodate the various play/recreation choices of children. Under Alternative B—Long-range Plan, the middle portion of the park (designated as the Sports Plateau; see Figure 2-2), would contain a full-size soccer field, a running track, and a baseball field in addition to the other amenities described for Alternative A.



Don Bullard - Jefferson Park Site Plan - Draft EIS Comment Period & Public Hearing

Page 1

**From:** <George.Robertson@consultgra.com>  
**To:** <don.bullard@ci.seattle.wa.us>  
**Date:** 5/18/02 10:22AM  
**Subject:** Jefferson Park Site Plan - Draft EIS Comment Period & Public Hearing

As a member of one of the many committees that worked long and hard, over many years, to make sure that the proposed Jefferson Park plan truly represents the best aspirations of the widest possible cross section of our user communities on Beacon Hill, I personally want to declare victory and move on as expeditiously as possible to building the vision that we see described in the Draft EIS. This project as described in the Draft EIS is the successful outcome of an open citizen participation planning process managed very sensitively by the professional team from Parks. A speedy review and transition to the construction phase of this project is recommended.

1

2

George Robertson Associates Inc. PS  
3416 19th Avenue South  
Seattle, WA 98144-6706  
206 723 4200 206 721 1986 FAX  
www.georgerobertson.com

## **Responses to George Robertson**

1. Comment noted.
2. Comment noted.

Seattle Department of Parks and Recreation  
Jefferson Park Site Plan  
Draft Environmental Impact Statement

Public Hearing  
May 30, 2002 – 7:00 pm

Public Hearing Comment Form

Please provide us with your written comments on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement for proposed Jefferson Park Site Plan Improvements. The deadline for comments is Friday, June 7, 2002.

To: Mr. Don Bullard  
Seattle Department of Parks and Recreation  
800 Maynard Avenue South, Third Floor  
Seattle, WA 98134-1336  
Phone: (206) 884-7158  
FAX: (206) 233-3949  
E-mail: [don.bullard@ci.seattle.wa.us](mailto:don.bullard@ci.seattle.wa.us)

- ① The impacts of lighting the fields on the South Reservoir hard lid needs to be better defined. I believe that the effects on the residents west of the park will be quite dramatic. The impacts on views from Lawn Bowling will also be very harsh. Please do the kind of detailed analysis that you did for transportation in the document. 1
- ② I believe that people will cross 15<sup>th</sup> at the point where Columbian Way ~~ends~~ flows into it (at the point where there is a planted island). Please analyze the safety issues surrounding this crossing. 2

From (optional): MIRA LATOSZEK  
Name / Affiliation  
2011 S. HANFORD ST  
SEATTLE WA 98144  
Address



area. It is not planned as a crosswalk, but that won't keep kids from dashing across at this point (that island will be mighty tempting). Perhaps it should be a marked crosswalk so that drivers coming off of I-5 on Columbian will expect pedestrians.

- ③ You mention the lighting from the driving range & the golf maintenance facility security lighting.

I believe this lighting is a safety issue for park users. When you walk south on the path from the community center to the lawn bowling club at night, you are effectively blinded by these lights because they are coming right at you. You can't see very much in front or to the sides - rather than enhancing visibility, these lights impede it. Please include this issue in the safety section of the document.

- ④ Please include a discussion of what happens to the artwork at the NW corner of the park. Is it moved & returned or does it get destroyed so that the construction & grading can occur.

- ⑤ In your discussion of bus/light rail routes, you should include the Route 38. In Sept 2002, this route will be extended down the west side of Beacon Hill & into the Industrial District. This can impact your transportation studies. The extended 38, though it's not adjacent to the Park, will provide access to Beacon Hill & the Park because it will connect with the numerous bus & rail routes along Holgate & Landet.

- ⑥ What kind of impact will sports field lighting have on wildlife & migratory birds? Please include a discussion.

**Response to Mira Latoszek**

1. The EIS evaluated the sports fields, and potential lighting, on the proposed Sports Plateau at a programmatic level of evaluation. The analysis indicated that nighttime views of downtown Seattle would be affected by field lighting at the Sports Plateau from areas such as the lawn bowling facility. Residences west of 15th Avenue South and north of South Spokane Street would also experience some impacts from increased light. Overall lighting impacts would affect a limited number of park users and nearby residences. At present, it is unknown if these fields will be lit. If Parks makes the decision to light these fields, a detailed lighting plan would be developed that would undergo further environmental review for changes to this analysis.
2. The existing 15th Avenue South/South Columbian Way intersection configuration is not appropriate for an at-grade pedestrian crossing. The signal operation does not provide for a pedestrian crossing phase and the lane geometry creates an extremely long pedestrian crossing distance. At this location, a pedestrian could be required to cross as many as nine lanes. The Department of Parks and Recreation has proposed that a pedestrian crossing, traffic calming improvements, and pedestrian-actuated signals be installed at the South Dakota Street/15th Avenue South intersection when appropriate signal warrants are met. This improvement is intended to provide a crossing location for 15th Avenue South with shorter crossing distances, better sight distances, and easier pedestrian signal phasing. Seattle Parks and Recreation will continue to consider all potential pedestrian and bicycle improvements that work to enhance pedestrian access and safety consistent with Seattle Transportation requirements.
3. Lighting at the driving range is not addressed as part of this EIS. Parks acknowledges the intensity of the driving range lights, however they do not operate the driving range. Seattle Golf, an independent organization, currently operates the driving range. In Parks' effort to coordinate improvements to Jefferson Park, a copy of the EIS, containing your comments, will be sent to Seattle Golf. It is Parks understanding that lighting improvements will be made by Seattle Golf in their next upgrade.
4. The current plan is to remove existing artwork at Jefferson Park prior to construction activities and store it off-site. Artwork located east of the water quality building and at the north and south entrances to the Beacon right-of-way parking areas are owned by the Seattle Arts Commission. Removal, storage, and relocation of these pieces would be coordinated with the Seattle Arts Commission prior to initiation of construction activities.
5. A variety of transit improvements, including those planned by Metro and Sound Transit, would enhance accessibility to Jefferson Park. If more park users choose to use transit to access the park, it would aid in reducing traffic demand and demand for parking near Jefferson Park. Although the planned extension of Route 38 was not specifically mentioned in the DEIS, the transportation analysis reflects the expectation that park users will walk from nearby residences and from transit routes serving the area and the larger Beacon Hill area.
6. There is scientific evidence that indicates that artificial lighting can negatively affect migrating birds and other wildlife (Harder, *Science News*, April 20, 2002) when new

lighting is introduced to dark night skies. The proposed field lighting is not expected to impact wildlife at Jefferson Park, however, because Beacon Hill is an urban area that is already lit by street lights, traffic lights, street signs, security lighting for homes and businesses, etc. Nonetheless, Parks is planning to install modern, shielded light fixtures that minimize overspill and glare should they decide to light the Sports Plateau. The cumulative effect of adding field lighting to the existing driving range lights and other light sources in the Jefferson Park area would be negligible given the existing nighttime light conditions in the area, therefore no substantial impacts to migrating birds or wildlife are expected as a result of the Jefferson Park Sports Plateau improvements.

Following are the transcribed testimonies from the May 30, 2002 Public Hearing on the Jefferson Park Site Plan Draft EIS. Testimonies are presented in this document in the order given at the Public Hearing.

- Frederica Merrill
- Jose Abrego
- Robert Hinrix
- Kristin Jackson
- Mike Carney
- Ed Bogarts
- George Robertson

**Frederica Merrill**

**3308 19th Avenue S.**

*Transcribed Public Hearing Testimony*

Yes, I have a few comments, on parking on your on your analysis of the existing parking you have missed a couple of areas. On page 3-37 you need to add the parking behind fire station 13 and you also need to add the parking at the golf and maintenance facility, and there's a number of spaces there too.

1

Additional parking issue – you used a 400' boundary from the project area to discuss overflow parking in the neighborhoods, and I disagree with this. I think you really ought to extend that, especially on Spokane Street the 400' boundary from the park boundary on the east side, especially when we have the pedestrian access off of Spokane. I live on 19th Avenue South, and there's a big difference between 19th Avenue South and 18th Avenue South. You stop your overflow at 18th, 18th is a much narrower street, 19th is a wider street. We get a lot of passenger traffic, get a lot of speeding, you would end up putting in traffic circles and I know we are going to end up with more parking overflow actually than 18th, even though I know it's a long ways. It's a wider and more heavily used street and it's right at the top of the ridge, you don't have to walk up the hill, so I would like to see that extended. I think also people on 24th would also appreciate that, because in the end I think you are going to get overflow parking all around that corner where we've got the pedestrian access.

2

One other parking issue, I strongly support the proposition on page 3-58 that you do joint interagency agreements with the school district and the veterans admin center to maximize existing parking during the hours when it's not fully used, like on weekends, especially Asa Mercer. I think that should be pursued no matter what.

3

On historic impacts on the reservoirs, on page 3-69, I disagree that there is no significant aesthetic feature to the water reservoirs, the significant aesthetic feature is the fountain. There has always been an operational fountain in this park, either at the south reservoir or the north reservoir. Those existing fountains are historic features and have been in existence since 1911 and the design team should have recognized them as historic features in their discussion when the Parks Dept presented this. That those water features are historic and they are significant aesthetic features. So I would like to see a mitigation added and I think there is a lot of mitigation that could be done, including taking those existing fountain structures and placing them in the park as an art installation, either with an operating fountain or without operating fountain, just as an art installation and certainly an inclusion of other sort of fountain features that are more modern, that needs to be added.

4

I'm concerned about the impacts to the route quality on Columbia[n] Way, Spokane Street, and 15th Avenue South from the combined road trips of the reservoir decommissioning project at both north and south, and the field coming in and I don't see that in here anywhere. I know that, that many truck trips, with that much soil in them, is going to ruin our roads, basically. Spokane, 15th and Columbia[n] are going to get rutted, there's going to be damage to the asphalt, and that stuff has to be corrected afterwards, because we are going to be having an increased traffic loads afterwards because of the Park construction.

5



On pedestrian access, I don't think you have spent enough time examining pedestrian use, current pedestrian use, and anticipated, increased pedestrian use and whether it be a proposal has been made in this plan. I totally support you know the overpass and the 15th Avenue, whether those are adequate to provide safe pedestrian access to the park. Right now this park has really poor pedestrian access, it's not safe, you've got busy arterials almost all the way around. I don't know what we put in there as adequate or not, but I would like to see more discussion of whether we need even additional pedestrian access, maybe even additional lights and some estimate of what our additional pedestrian access is going to be, that's not in there anywhere, you have additional car trips but you don't have anything on additional pedestrian trips. I think there's going to be a lot of pedestrian trips.

6

I also would like to see the Parks Department, and I know that this makes more work for you guys, but I would like to see you go to SPU and ask them if they would prefer that you do a combined project EIS with the new assumptions now on the south reservoir. And the reason I would like to ask you to do this, is because SPU has clearly put out for us on this Park, and they are really going to be putting out for us in the future. I think Parks needs to make every effort to get out there and support them too. And one of the things they are particularly concerned about is the cost of burying these reservoirs and doing these projects, there's the EIS costs and kind of some of the hassles they have gone through in the past, like cleaning the reservoirs. So if you guys can do something to help them out and get in there and maybe expand this EIS and make it more realistic. Because at this point this whole discussion of Alternative A and Alternative B neither one of these are accurate anymore. I mean, I know this is a drag for you, but as of this meeting you know, tomorrow and next week, these are going to be inaccurate statements. Neither are we going to be looking at Alternative A, neither are we going to be looking at Alternative B that occurs after Alternative A. We are going to be looking at simultaneous decommissioning of the reservoirs, simultaneous reconstruction, and so let's get it right, let's do an EIS that is an accurate reflection of what's really going to be happened, all the commuting truck trips. And help SPU out on this, because it will also shorten the project time for them.

7

One of their big concerns is, how the heck are they going get all these things buried in a quick enough time frame. And use of the Parks helping them, I would like to see that kind of joint Parks Department assistance.

8

## Responses to Frederica Merrill

1. The summary of existing parking facilities was prepared to primarily focus on those parking areas that are typically used for activities related to Jefferson Park activities. It is recognized that there are other smaller parking facilities in the vicinity including behind Fire Station #13 and at the golf and maintenance facility as well as at the Veterans Affairs Medical Center. Since these parking areas are more likely to be used regularly by users not associated with activities being evaluated for this project, they were not specifically identified.
2. As outlined in the Transportation section of the EIS, the on-street parking utilization study was performed according to guidelines developed by the City of Seattle in its Client Assistance Memorandum #117. This memorandum defines the study area for a parking utilization study as “an area which is within a 400 foot walking distance of the subject property.” This distance is chosen because it is the approximate distance that drivers will typically walk from an off-site parking space to a destination. (This does not reflect conditions with major events.) The EIS included all roadways within 400 feet of the entire Jefferson Park site (bounded on the north by South Spokane Street and on the east by Beacon Avenue South). It should be noted that most of the new activities made possible by this project would be located some distance from the Spokane Street/Beacon Avenue intersection. Except during major events, it is unlikely that users would park north of the Spokane Street/Beacon Avenue South intersection since it is much farther than 400 feet from new activities proposed by this project.

As described in the Transportation section, the project is expected to increase parking demand at the site on typical weekdays and Saturdays. However, the increase in demand for typical conditions is expected to be accommodated by the existing parking facilities and by new parking spaces proposed with the project. It is recognized that during large events, which would occur relatively infrequently, parking will exceed the supply along Beacon Avenue South and may spill over to on-street parking north of South Spokane Street including as far as away 19th Avenue South. However, for most conditions, more-convenient parking would be available. 19th Avenue South is approximately 3 feet wider than 18th Avenue South. However, both roadways allow on-street parking on both sides, which reduces the effective travel way to one lane. This is common for residential streets throughout Seattle. Based on observations of parking and operations of both roadways, there is not significantly more parking capacity along 19th Avenue South that would attract disproportionately more overspill parking from Jefferson Park users on peak event days compared to 18th Avenue South.

3. Comment noted.
4. The Beacon Reservoirs, including the fountains, do not appear to meet many of the City's criteria developed for historic status. It is recognized that the fountains within the reservoirs are important to some members of the community. Parks will consider possible salvage options for the fountain mechanisms with SPU prior to demolition activities.

Alternative A and B include water features as part of the Great Meadow design. A pond with a fountain would be constructed in the northwest corner of the Great Meadow. A constructed stream would flow from this northern pond southeast to another pond near the Community Center buildings that would contain two fountains. These water features are intended to represent the historic presence of the Beacon Reservoirs and the fountains in the ponds would provide symbolic reference to the existing reservoir fountains. See Figures 2-1, 2-2, 3-2 and 3-3 for a conceptual view of the proposed water features.

5. Transportation of fill material would occur in trucks permitted to operate on City roadways. The trucks are required to be under specified load limits to minimize impacts to pavements on local roadways. Most pavements are designed to accommodate typical levels of truck traffic over the lifetime of a pavement. The proposed project is not anticipated to significantly degrade pavement conditions along the surrounding arterials. If pavement damage does occur at site access locations due to inadequate pavement structure or excessive loading, the pavement would be patched and repaired.
6. Due to the types of new recreational facilities planned as part of the Jefferson Park project, many of the new users are expected to access the park on foot or using bicycles. The number of new pedestrian and bicycle trips will vary greatly depending on the day of the week (weekend trips are expected to be greater than weekday trips), weather, the time of year, and the events and activities held at the park. Pedestrians are expected to access the site from neighborhoods surrounding the park including residential areas north of South Spokane Street and west of 15th Avenue South. Some pedestrian access may also occur from the south via Columbian Way South. As a result, the proposed project is including extensive improvements to enhance pedestrian access and safety to and from Jefferson Park. The project includes walkway improvements throughout Jefferson Park, including formal walkways along frontage roadways such as Beacon Avenue South, 15th Avenue South, and 16th Avenue South as part of the comprehensive trails system. The project would include several pedestrian crossing improvements including pavement treatments to calm traffic and identify pedestrian areas to drivers. Under Alternative B, the project would construct a new pedestrian overpass across South Spokane Street between 16th and 17th Avenues South. This overpass would improve safety and access for pedestrians and cyclists. Overall, access for pedestrian and bicycle modes will be enhanced by the proposed project. Also of note, the roadways surrounding the park are an important part of Seattle's arterial transportation system and serve as key access routes for freight and commuter traffic. Therefore, pedestrian and bicycle crossings require careful review by Seattle Transportation. Seattle Parks and Recreation will continue to consider all potential pedestrian and bicycle improvements that work to enhance pedestrian access and safety consistent with Seattle Transportation requirements.
7. Development of the alternatives in this EIS was done in conjunction with SPU, specifically to facilitate future environmental review. While Alternative B analyzed the impacts related to park use on a buried South Reservoir at a programmatic level, evaluation of the environmental issues related to demolition and reconstruction of a South Reservoir would still need to be conducted. If a decision is made to move forward with

the buried reservoir proposal, SPU will be able to use this EIS in their future environmental evaluation, reducing the time spent on research and analysis. This EIS anticipated that subsequent environmental analysis might need to be conducted due to changes in circumstances such as new projects or changes to projects, changes in assumptions, and potential for a buried reservoir. Provisions for phasing environmental analyses are available under the State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA). SEPA anticipates that “phased environmental review assists agencies and the public to focus on issues that are ready for decision and exclude from consideration issues already decided or not yet ready” (WAC 197.11.060.(5)(a)). An initial evaluation of impacts for each potential future action will determine the level of environmental analysis that will be necessary to comply with SEPA. Cumulative impacts of demolishing both reservoirs and constructing the buried reservoirs with the construction of park features will certainly need to be considered in subsequent analyses. A new EIS may not be necessary depending on results of this initial evaluation. In addition to a completely new EIS, there are a number of other outcomes that are possible, including a determination of non-significance (DNS), a mitigated DNS, an Addendum to this EIS or previously issued SEPA document, or a Supplemental EIS.

8. While the Mayor’s recent plan now increases the potential that a buried reservoir will be constructed, Council approval will still be required. That decision process is likely to be done in conjunction with overall deliberations on the City’s budget, in the fall. If and when approved, SPU could then proceed on developing the demolition and reconstruction project of the reservoirs and conducting the appropriate environmental analysis. In the meantime, Parks is scheduled to make a decision on the Jefferson Park Site Plan in order to move forward on needed Park improvements. With the opportunity for phased review, delaying the Jefferson Park EIS to accommodate the potential for a buried South Reservoir is not necessary.

**Jose Abrego** (*Mike Carney provided translation*)

**4725 S. Mead Avenue**

*Transcribed Public Hearing Testimony*

He wants to see a map that shows the soccer fields, because all the fields are full. He would like it with the synthetic turf to bring the children to play. In Alternative A there is no picture of the soccer fields, and I think all the other places, he is saying he wants to see soccer fields. He may not have understood all of that. So if we get the turf in the field that would work.

1

I have many friends who have no place to play and he has brought a list of people – they are working --- and they would like to have their voices heard, but they are working right now. I can give you this list, there is only telephone numbers. That's it.

2

List of handwritten names submitted by Mr. Abrego:

- Elena Olea
- Ovidia Abrego
- Maura Mirian
- Ines Abrego
- Ernesto Martinez
- Wilfredo Salinas
- Eduardo Maeder



### **Responses to Jose Abrego**

1. Alternative B would include a full-size soccer field within the area called the Sports Plateau. See Figures 2-1 and 2-2. In light of the Mayor's plan to bury all of the City of Seattle's reservoirs over the next 9 years, there is a strong possibility that the South Reservoir area will become available for park use in approximately 5 years.
2. Comment noted. [Seven signatures were included on the petition.]

**Robert Hinrix**

**3217 14th South**

*Transcribed Public Hearing Testimony*

I too would like to see the draft of the EIS include the hard lids simultaneously. I think that's something that, as it does appear now, we are going to get the buried reservoir. That the two of them have to be considered together and the impact will be greater probably will help expedite the entire process for SPU as we go through that. And it would be a shame to see them have to do another EIS for the buried reservoir. It's really something that I think the two departments, the Parks Dept and SPU can be working together on. And my discussions with SPU, that is something they are concerned about because of their experience with Lincoln Reservoir. And I think we have a very unique opportunity, by combining all the projects together, analyzing them together to expedite the entire process, speed up the entire process, to bring costs down and thereby also mitigating some of the negative impacts of construction in the park. To make it happen as quickly as possible for the community and also to just keep costs down for the City.

1

## **Responses to Robert Hinrix**

1. Refer to response to F. Merrill comment 7.

**Kristin Jackson**  
**3222 Lafayette Ave.**

*Transcribed Public Hearing Testimony*

I would like to agree with Frederica Merrill's statement and also put in another\_\_\_\_\_ or more concern about aesthetics.

It is an historic park, therefore construction in the park should reflect some kind of early 20th century aesthetic. ] 1

And I would also like it to reflect that all the paved surfaces in the park be concrete or some other smooth surface that would be easy on wheelchairs. ] 2

## **Responses to Kristin Jackson**

1. Jefferson Park was identified by the Olmsted Brothers as an important component in their proposal for a comprehensive system of parks and boulevards for Seattle. Although few elements of the plan for Jefferson Park were built, and little remains of what was constructed, the site plan for Jefferson Park can create some of the envisioned relationships -- and also create park spaces inspired by the Olmsteds' design principles. These include a system of pedestrian trails linking uses and activities, a variety of open spaces defined by shade trees, and a combination of formal and informal plan elements. Unrealized historical plan features that may influence the new site plan include:
  - additional parallel rows of trees and pedestrian promenades along the Beacon Avenue boulevard;
  - clustering of active sports fields and formal geometric plan elements adjacent to the boulevard; and
  - a curvilinear path/road weaving through the central and southern portions to the park establishing strong physical links to the neighborhood to the west, to golf course east of the boulevard and to the Cheasty Blvd. greenbelt.

Alternatives A and B are designed to "respect and respond to the traditions of the Olmsted legacy" (see page 2-2 of the EIS). Project elements would be designed and constructed to be complementary in bulk and scale to the surrounding neighborhood. Building design would be sensitive to the local neighborhood character. Specific design parameters will be determined at a later date by Parks and their selected design consultants, along with input from the community.

2. Access to all destination points in the Jefferson Park Site Plan area will be compliant with the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA). ADA Guidelines allow use of a variety of surfaces for trails including compacted crushed gravel, asphalt, and concrete.



**Mike Carney**

**3212 21st South**

*Transcribed Public Hearing Testimony*

My name is Mike Carney, and I prepared what I was going to say before we heard—we hadn't got the news yet, so I'll just add it in anyway. One comment, I enjoyed your document on line. I think one addition I would make, to sort of document it, that design discussion, sort of like on the path, and there were a few steps that you skipped, well I thought why not put them in.

1

In October, you had on the internet or web page, what you called the Preferred Plan. That was the one plan where we had a consensus vote. And it didn't show up in your set, so I brought you a copy. Because you showed it, I thought, a number of things, you might want to put it in just for completeness.

2

Last time I sort of harangued the soccer players and I'm not going to do that today. Because I called around to the schools, at well, within a mile, and I thought all of them might be represented here, so I just, and I remember asking if the EIS included the population it was impacting. This was an argument for facility, that might come out of this. So off the web I down loaded the schools, Franklin has 1629 students, someone there authorized me to speak for them. Kimble, PTA is happy to have a playground with 539 students. Cleveland High School, the soccer coach is John Wedge, said they have 753 and they have no place to play soccer this spring. They are to start this spring. At Asa Mercer, their principal said, yeah she wants that track, she wants all that stuff there, because they have 833 students. Beacon Hill Elementary, they have soccer players on their field. They don't want them there. They want to play somewhere else, so they won't destroy the grass, and they have 335 students. O'Dea High School uses the grounds here right now. Monty Kohler, I don't think he is here today, they have 480 students. They are not really in the neighborhood, but they use the facility. And if they had a place to, not destroy it if they had synthetic turf, that would be much better. St. George's parish, just over there in front of that, Father Mahoney, said they would very much like to play on a field. Maple Elem. is here, they are here, I didn't bug them, because they already have a field and their PTA doesn't need\_\_\_\_ I couldn't get to them, they have 482 students. But these are the children in the neighborhood who are hoping for facilities.

3

### **Responses to Mike Carney**

1. Comment noted.
2. The Preferred Plan, as well as the previously developed Concensus Plans, have been added to Appendix and briefly described in the text in Chapter 2.
3. Comment noted. Refer to L. McCann comment 1 and J. Abrego comment 1.

**Ed Bogarts**

**23207 208th SE –Maple Valley**

*Transcribed Public Hearing Testimony*

And this is just a general comment, I just wanted to let your group know that the Seattle Parks and Recreation and the VA, I have a document here that is going to allow them ingress and egress using our fire lanes, south of the south foyer fence so that they can expedite, hopefully, get the 9-hole loop path built a little quicker. We are going to try to do a little vegetation remodeling on our side of the fence. Hopefully, that will get done before winter.

1

I think we share parking spaces just by nature. When I did the parking structure in 1998, you can probably see and I should get rid of them, I didn't put any signage back, because the union wanted us to have employee parking, and I didn't do it. I park out on Beacon, to be honest with you, because it's wider, but anyway, I think that just by nature, I know that \_\_\_\_\_ uses the Beacon parking and possibly ours, and I don't think on weekends we have any difficulty.

2

And I thought we had an agreement already, written or unwritten, that use of parking can be done.

## **Responses to Ed Bogarts**

1. Comment noted.
2. Parks will verify the existence of a joint parking agreement with the Veterans Affairs Medical Center. If one is not in place, a new joint agreement will be pursued as part of the Jefferson Park renovation project that would specify a shared parking arrangement for heavy use days and large attendance events.

**George Robertson**

**3416 19th Avenue South**

*Transcribed Public Hearing Testimony*

I just wanted to speak for a second about the point that the gentlemen raised. I think that the sports fields, if anything, the thing we couldn't find a place for, because we went through the process, the timing and planning this facility. There has always been an attempt to try to deal with it, just didn't fit, without some more space. Suddenly it looks like we are going to have the space, so I think it is important we realize that that's the primary unfulfilled community objective that was left behind in the planning stage. I think there's an enormous support amongst all the people who did this design to see that this need gets met when we build the lid.

1

I think I wish to support the notion of joining the EIS's together in order to try to take any step we can take to smooth the path at the beginning of the buried reservoir.

2

## **Responses to George Robertson**

1. Refer to response to L. McCann comment 1 and J. Abrego comment 1.
2. Refer to response to F. Merrill comment 7.